

the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow individuals eligible for veterans health benefits to contribute to health savings accounts.

S. 3737

At the request of Mr. LIEBERMAN, the name of the Senator from Indiana (Mr. LUGAR) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3737, a bill to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Washington-Rochambeau Route National Historic Trail.

S. 3744

At the request of Mr. DURBIN, the name of the Senator from Oregon (Mr. SMITH) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3744, a bill to establish the Abraham Lincoln Study Abroad Program.

S. 3800

At the request of Mr. HAGEL, the name of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. BUNNING) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3800, a bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to require recipients of United States foreign assistance to certify that the assistance will not be used to intentionally traffic in goods or services that contain counterfeit marks or for other purposes that promote the improper use of intellectual property, and for other purposes.

S. 3837

At the request of Mr. AKAKA, the name of the Senator from Washington (Mrs. MURRAY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 3837, a bill to authorize the establishment of the Henry Kuualoha Giugni Kupuna Memorial Archives at the University of Hawaii.

S. 3880

At the request of Mr. INHOFE, the names of the Senator from Ohio (Mr. DEWINE) and the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SANTORUM) were added as cosponsors of S. 3880, a bill to provide the Department of Justice the necessary authority to apprehend, prosecute, and convict individuals committing animal enterprise terror.

S. CON. RES. 116

At the request of Mr. DODD, the name of the Senator from Utah (Mr. HATCH) was added as a cosponsor of S. Con. Res. 116, a concurrent resolution supporting "Lights On Afterschool!", a national celebration of after school programs.

STATEMENTS ON INTRODUCED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

By Mr. DOMENICI (for himself and Mr. BINGAMAN):

S. 3907. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct a study of water resources in the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

Mr. DOMENICI. Mr. President, above-average rainfall in New Mexico this summer has led many to turn a blind eye to the grim water situation faced by our State only 2 months ago. New Mexico was fast approaching a disaster due to drought. Many of our municipalities' wells were running dry and

reservoirs were at dangerously low levels. Providence intervened; narrowly averting a crisis resulting from water scarcity.

The development of the centrifugal pump was an event of great significance in the history of the West. Windmill driven pumps provided enough water for a family and several livestock. The centrifugal pump, on the other hand, was capable of pumping 800 gallons of water a minute, making possible the habitation of what was previously barren desert. To a large extent, this invention provided the water for growing towns and agricultural industry. However, it also resulted in a great dependence on groundwater. As such, we need to fully understand the nature and extent of our groundwater resources. This bill will provide us with the information necessary to ensure that the water on which we have come to rely is available for years to come.

During times of drought, when surface water is scarce, we must be able to reliably turn to groundwater reserves. Approximately 90 percent of New Mexicans depend on groundwater for drinking water and 77 percent of New Mexicans obtain water exclusively from groundwater sources. While groundwater supplies throughout the State are coming under increasing competition, not enough is known about these resources in order to make sound decisions regarding their use.

Nearly 40 percent of the State's population resides in the Middle Rio Grande Basin. Once thought to contain vast quantities of water, we are now faced with the reality the Middle Rio Grande Basin contains far less water than originally thought. Between 1995 and 2001, the United States Geological Survey undertook a study of the basin which added greatly to our knowledge regarding the primary source of water for our largest population center. Had we proceeded with our water planning without the information provided by this study, I have little doubt that we would ultimately find ourselves in a dire situation. However, there is much more to be learned about this basin.

Roughly 65 percent of the State's population lives along the Rio Grande. Also located along the river are the four largest cities in New Mexico: Santa Fe, Albuquerque, Rio Rancho and Las Cruces. While the completion of the San Juan-Chama Diversion by the Albuquerque Bernalillo County Water Utility Authority will allow the county of Bernalillo and city of Albuquerque to take advantage of their allocation of San Juan-Chama water, the remainder of the cities and counties located along the Rio Grande will continue to receive the majority of their water from aquifers beneath the Rio Grande. Aside from the Middle Rio Grande Basin, we have limited knowledge of the amount of water contained in the aquifers below the Rio Grande, the rate at which they recharge, aquifer contamination, and the interaction between surface flows and ground water.

Elsewhere in the State, even less is understood regarding groundwater resources. While there is limited unallocated surface water in the State, there are significant quantities of untapped underground water in the Tularosa and Salt Basins. The Tularosa Basin is approximately 60 miles wide and 200 miles long. Making the conservative estimate that 10 percent of the water contained in that aquifer is available for use through desalination, it would provide 100 years of water for a city the size of Albuquerque. With the development of desalination technology, I anticipate that even a greater amount of the brackish water contained in the Tularosa Basin will be available for human use.

Another untapped water supply is the Salt Basin located in southern New Mexico. The basin lies in a geologically complex area and our understanding of the total resource is incomplete. However, initial estimates predict sustainable withdrawals on the order of 100,000 acre-feet per year of potable water from the New Mexico portion of the aquifer. This is enough water to support a city the size of our largest municipal area. Additional brackish resources in that basin are highly likely. Because the basin is located near expanding metropolitan areas near the U.S.-Mexico Border, it is a resource of critical importance.

The bill I introduce today would direct the United States Geological Survey, in collaboration with the State of New Mexico, to undertake a groundwater resources study in the State of New Mexico. A comprehensive study of the State's water resources is critical to effective water planning. Absent such a study, I fear that there is a significant likelihood that we may be depleting aquifers at an unsustainable rate.

I thank Senator BINGAMAN for being an original co-sponsor of this legislation. I also thank Representative HEATHER WILSON for introducing companion legislation in the House of Representatives and I look forward to working with them to ensure the bill's passage.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the bill be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3707

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "New Mexico Aquifer Assessment Act of 2006".

SEC. 2. NEW MEXICO WATER RESOURCES STUDY.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Geological Survey (referred to in this Act as the "Secretary"), in coordination with the State of New Mexico (referred to in this Act as the "State") and any other entities that the Secretary determines to be appropriate (including other Federal agencies and institutions of higher education),

shall, in accordance with this Act and any other applicable law, conduct a study of water resources in the State, including—

(1) a survey of groundwater resources, including an analysis of—

(A) aquifers in the State, including the quantity of water in the aquifers;

(B) the availability of groundwater resources for human use;

(C) the salinity of groundwater resources;

(D) the potential of the groundwater resources to recharge;

(E) the interaction between groundwater and surface water;

(F) the susceptibility of the aquifers to contamination; and

(G) any other relevant criteria; and

(2) a characterization of surface and bed-rock geology, including the effect of the geology on groundwater yield and quality.

(b) **STUDY AREAS.**—The study carried out under subsection (a) shall include the Estancia Basin, Salt Basin, Tularosa Basin, Hueco Basin, and middle Rio Grande Basin in the State.

(c) **REPORT.**—Not later than 2 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and the Committee on Resources of the House of Representatives a report that describes the results of the study.

(d) **AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this Act.

By Mr. WYDEN (for himself and Mr. BENNETT):

S. 3908. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a credit for fuel-efficient motor vehicles and to require major integrated oil companies to amortize intangible drilling and development costs; to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, after years and years of congressional gridlock on the issue of automobile efficiency, I and Senator BENNETT of Utah are today bringing to the Senate legislation that is market oriented, bipartisan, and a bill that we believe will bring millions and millions of fuel-efficient automobiles, cars, and trucks to the streets of our country.

We put our Nation on the road to energy independence by rewarding drivers who buy more fuel-efficient cars, trucks, and SUVs. These rewards, under the legislation I have drafted with the distinguished Senator from Utah, Mr. BENNETT, are available on a sliding scale. The more fuel-efficient the vehicle, the greater the reward that the consumer would receive.

We also put the brakes on a needless subsidy to the major oil companies and use the savings that are derived from stopping that windfall to reward consumers in their wallets for helping to end our country's oil dependence. To his credit, the President of the United States has said: You don't need these incentives when oil is over \$55 a barrel, as it is today.

I asked the CEOs when the major oil companies came before a joint hearing—I see the distinguished Senator from Alaska in the chair. He will recall at our hearing, the joint Commerce and Energy hearing that was held, I asked the oil company executives of the

major companies whether they needed the various tax breaks that were currently offered, and to a person, they said they did not.

I see my good friend from Utah, and I thank him for his efforts to make this legislation bipartisan. What I will do, now that the Senator from Utah has arrived, is briefly describe how our bipartisan legislation works and why we think this will be a major transformation in terms of the cars, trucks, and SUVs on the roads of our country.

Under our bipartisan, market-oriented bill, consumers who buy vehicles that are at least 25 percent more fuel efficient than the applicable standards, called CAFE, would get a rebate of at least \$630 and as much as \$1,860 for the most fuel-efficient cars. We have separate standards for cars and trucks so the consumers can choose the type of vehicle they want and still get the rebate or the credit as long as they choose a fuel-efficient model.

In the past, the automobile industry has said that fuel economy standards are hard to achieve because car buyers place little value on fuel economy. The new program created by our bill directly addresses that concern by providing rebates to consumers for purchasing fuel-efficient vehicles.

Many in the automobile industry have also said that car buyers don't fully appreciate the value of lifetime fuel savings at the time of purchase. I and Senator BENNETT believe this will change that by providing the rebates or the credits through focusing consumer attention on fuel efficiency at the time of purchase.

It will be possible for consumers at the time of purchase to see the type of notice I am holding as a sticker on the window of the automobile. So right at the time of purchase, because of this sticker—I am holding a copy of it—it will be possible for purchasers to see the real value of fuel-efficient purchases in the automotive sector.

For vehicles that qualify, the rebate or credit amount would be printed on the window sticker, as I have described, and the consumer could claim the rebate as a tax credit on his or her tax return. Alternatively, I and Senator BENNETT conceived that the rebate could be transferred to automobile dealers, allowing dealers to provide the rebates to consumers as cash back at the time of purchase.

In our view, the legislation also builds on the incentives that were provided in the Energy bill specifically for hybrid gasoline/electric-powered cars. We believe the approach that we are advocating will be especially popular because it is simpler and fairer. For example, unlike the hybrid credit that is in the energy bill, there is no phaseout of the incentives we propose, based on when a hybrid carmaker sells its 60,000th car. Because our legislation eliminates the truly complicated phaseout of the credit that now exists, it is our view that consumers will not be confused as they are today about

when they can get a credit and how much it will be. Also, unlike the approach taken in the energy legislation, our bipartisan bill does not pick winners and losers among competitive technology. It takes a technology-neutral approach that allows any vehicle that has superior fuel efficiency to qualify for a rebate, whether it uses hybrid or conventional technologies.

I also want to emphasize why I think it is important that we take bolder action to jumpstart the markets for fuel-efficient vehicles. As I mentioned, there is a phaseout for the incentives today based on when a hybrid carmaker sells its 60,000th car. We have tried to get our arms around exactly how many of these alternative-fuel vehicles are going to be purchased this year. Many estimates seem to be just a bit over 100,000. But compare those 100,000 hybrids to the 1.8 million vehicles that could be purchased with the kind of incentives that I and Senator BENNETT are proposing. We are significantly increasing, through a marketplace approach, the chance to multiply many times over the number of fuel-efficient vehicles on the streets of our country. The distinguished Senator from Alaska who is in the chair has sat in on many of the debates with me on the Energy Committee where we have heard views expressed about what could be done through a regulatory approach. Those approaches have been fought to gridlock on the floor of the Senate.

What I and Senator BENNETT want to do is something very different. We want to use a marketplace approach to significantly jumpstart the market for these fuel-efficient vehicles over the next 5 years. Compare 100,000 hybrid vehicles that are likely to be purchased this year to the 1.8 million vehicles that could be purchased for each of the next 5 years under the legislation we are advocating and we get a sense of the difference in approach and why we think ours is very much needed and can make a break with the policies that have produced gridlock on the floor of the Senate.

Finally, I would wrap up by saying that the legislation I and Senator BENNETT are proposing is fully paid for. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, our bill saves \$6.8 billion by limiting just one of the tax breaks that the major oil companies have said they no longer need. It is known as the expensing of intangible drilling costs, which includes land acquisition costs, development costs, and the costs of leasing equipment. The Congressional Research Service has called this special break economically inefficient. I looked very carefully at it after the hearing attended by myself and the distinguished Senator from Alaska and others, when I asked the major oil executives if they needed all of the tax breaks that were currently allowed under the code. They said they did not. The President, to his credit, said the major oil companies do not need tax

breaks when the price of oil is over \$55 a barrel.

So according to the analysis done by the Joint Committee on Taxation, the savings derived by limiting one tax break for major oil companies more than covers the \$1.3 billion-per-year cost of the marketplace-oriented rebate and credit program.

To finally sum up, I believe our legislation—we call it OILSAVE—is a winner for consumers, a winner for energy security, and a winner for taxpayers. It is a win for the consumer because it helps our Nation's energy security by the purchase of what could be millions of fuel-efficient cars and trucks and SUVs. It helps us kick our Nation's oil dependence by stimulating the purchase of a number of greener vehicles at home and by limiting a tax break the Congressional Research Service calls economically inefficient. Finally, it is a win for our taxpayers because after the major oil company executives said that they didn't need this break, and the President indicated that with oil at these prices you didn't need incentives, it is possible for us now to jumpstart the marketplace for these vehicles without any additional costs to the taxpayers.

So I hope my colleagues will reflect on the difference between this discussion and the ones we have had previously on the floor of the Senate. The decibel level got pretty high during those past debates. When Senator BENNETT and I launched our discussion, it was a different kind of discussion. It was a discussion about how we can find common ground in the Senate, how we can be significantly bolder in the area of automobile efficiency. We have zeroed in on this area, an area I know has been of interest to the Presiding Officer over the years, because automobile efficiency is the ball game as it relates to the issue of energy security. That is where our oil is going.

So I hope our colleagues will be interested in the legislation that we are bringing to the Senate today. The OILSAVE legislation is a departure from the polarized debates we have had in this body.

I want to say, wrapping up, that I don't think I could have a better partner for this particular effort than the distinguished Senator from Utah. He is the chair, as our colleagues know, of the Joint Economic Committee. He has been interested in energy legislation as a member of the Republican leadership for quite some time. I would note that today is his birthday, and he has decided to use this special day, when his family is clamoring for his time, to be part of this bipartisan effort with me. I am very grateful for his involvement in this task, and I would like to yield the floor, if I might.

I also see our distinguished friend from West Virginia here, and if it is acceptable, perhaps Senator BENNETT could wrap up for our legislation, and then I know the entire Senate wishes to here the remarks of the distin-

guished senior Senator from West Virginia.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the OILSAVE bill introduced today be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the bill was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3908

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Oil Independence, Limiting Subsidies, and Accelerating Vehicle Efficiency (OILSAVE) Act".

SEC. 2. TAX CREDIT FOR FUEL-EFFICIENT MOTOR VEHICLES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subpart B of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 (relating to other credits) is amended by inserting after section 30C the following new section:

"SEC. 30D. FUEL-EFFICIENT MOTOR VEHICLE CREDIT.

"(a) ALLOWANCE OF CREDIT.—There shall be allowed a credit against the tax imposed by this chapter for the taxable year an amount equal to the applicable amount for each new qualified fuel-efficient motor vehicle placed in service by the taxpayer during the taxable year.

"(b) NEW QUALIFIED FUEL-EFFICIENT MOTOR VEHICLE.—For purposes of this section, the term 'new qualified fuel-efficient motor vehicle' means a motor vehicle (as defined under section 30(c)(2))—

"(1) which is a passenger automobile or a light truck,

"(2) which—

"(A) in the case of a passenger automobile, achieves a fuel economy of not less than 34.5 miles per gallon, and

"(B) in the case of a light truck, achieves a fuel economy of not less than 27.5 miles per gallon,

"(3) the original use of which commences with the taxpayer,

"(4) which is acquired for use or lease by the taxpayer and not for resale, and

"(5) which is made by a manufacturer for model year 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, or 2011.

"(c) APPLICABLE AMOUNT.—For purposes of this section, the applicable amount shall be determined as follows:

	In the case of a passenger automobile, the applicable amount is:	In the case of a light truck, the applicable amount is:
27.5 miles per gallon ..	\$0	\$630
28.5	0	710
29.5	0	780
30.5	0	850
31.5	0	920
32.5	0	980
33.5	0	1,040
34.5	630	1,090
35.5	700	1,140
36.5	760	1,190
37.5	820	1,240
38.5	880	1,280
39.5	940	1,320
40.5	990	1,360
41.5	1,040	1,400
42.5	1,090	1,430
43.5	1,140	1,470
44.5	1,180	1,500
45.5	1,220	1,530
46.5	1,260	1,560

	In the case of a passenger automobile, the applicable amount is:	In the case of a light truck, the applicable amount is:
"If the motor vehicle achieves a fuel economy of:		
47.5	1,300	1,590
48.5	1,340	1,620
49.5	1,370	1,640
50.5	1,410	1,670
51.5	1,440	1,690
52.5	1,470	1,720
53.5	1,500	1,740
54.5	1,530	1,760
55.5	1,560	1,780
56.5	1,590	1,800
57.5	1,610	1,820
58.5	1,640	1,840
59.5 or more	1,660	1,860

"(d) OTHER DEFINITIONS AND SPECIAL RULES.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) FUEL ECONOMY.—The term 'fuel economy' has the meaning given such term under section 32901(a)(10) of title 49, United States Code.

"(2) MODEL YEAR.—The term 'model year' has the meaning given such term under section 32901(a)(14) of such title.

"(3) OTHER TERMS.—The terms 'passenger automobile', 'light truck', and 'manufacturer' have the meaning given such terms in regulations prescribed by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency for purposes of the administration of title II of the Clean Air Act.

"(4) REDUCTION IN BASIS.—For purposes of this subtitle, the basis of any property for which a credit is allowable under subsection (a) shall be reduced by the amount of such credit so allowed.

"(5) NO DOUBLE BENEFIT.—

"(A) COORDINATION WITH OTHER VEHICLE CREDITS.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) with respect to any new qualified fuel-efficient motor vehicle for any taxable year if a credit is allowed with respect to such motor vehicle for such taxable year under section 30 or 30B.

"(B) OTHER TAX BENEFITS.—The amount of any deduction or credit (other than the credit allowable under this section and any credit described in subparagraph (A)) allowable under this chapter with respect to any new qualified fuel-efficient motor vehicle shall be reduced by the amount of credit allowed under subsection (a) for such motor vehicle for such taxable year.

"(6) PROPERTY USED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES, ETC., NOT QUALIFIED.—No credit shall be allowable under subsection (a) with respect to any property referred to in section 50(b)(1) or with respect to the portion of the cost of any property taken into account under section 179.

"(7) ELECTION NOT TO TAKE CREDIT.—No credit shall be allowed under subsection (a) for any vehicle if the taxpayer elects not to have this section apply to such vehicle.

"(8) INTERACTION WITH AIR QUALITY AND MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY STANDARDS.—Unless otherwise provided in this section, a motor vehicle shall not be considered eligible for a credit under this section unless such vehicle is in compliance with—

"(A) the applicable provisions of the Clean Air Act for the applicable make and model year of the vehicle (or applicable air quality provisions of State law in the case of a State which has adopted such provision under a waiver under section 209(b) of the Clean Air Act), and

“(B) the motor vehicle safety provisions of sections 30101 through 30169 of title 49, United States Code.

“(e) CREDIT MAY BE TRANSFERRED.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—A taxpayer may, in connection with the purchase of a new qualified fuel-efficient motor vehicle, transfer any credit allowable under subsection (a) to any person who is in the trade or business of selling new qualified fuel-efficient motor vehicles, but only if such person clearly discloses to such taxpayer, through the use of a window sticker attached to the new qualified fuel-efficient vehicle—

“(A) the amount of any credit allowable under subsection (a) with respect to such vehicle, and

“(B) a notification that the taxpayer will not be eligible for any credit under section 30 or 30B with respect to such vehicle unless the taxpayer elects not to have this section apply with respect to such vehicle.

“(2) CONSENT REQUIRED FOR REVOCATION.—Any transfer under paragraph (1) may be revoked only with the consent of the Secretary.

“(3) REGULATIONS.—The Secretary may prescribe such regulations as necessary to ensure that any credit described in paragraph (1) is claimed once and not retransferred by a transferee.”.

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENTS.—

(1) Section 1016(a) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by striking “and” at the end of paragraph (36), by striking the period at the end of paragraph (37) and inserting “, and”, and by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(38) to the extent provided in section 30D(d)(4).”.

(2) Section 6501(m) of such Code is amended by inserting “30D(d)(7),” after “30C(e)(5).”.

(3) The table of section for subpart C of part IV of subchapter A of chapter 1 of such Code is amended by inserting after the item relating to section 30C the following new item:

“Sec. 30D. Fuel-efficient motor vehicle credit.”.

(c) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to property placed in service after the date of the enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. AMORTIZATION OF INTANGIBLE DRILLING AND DEVELOPMENT COSTS FOR MAJOR INTEGRATED OIL COMPANIES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (i) of section 263 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended—

(1) by striking “INCURRED OUTSIDE THE UNITED STATES” in the heading,

(2) by inserting “or owned or operated by a major integrated oil company (as defined in section 167(h)(5)(B))” after “United States”, and

(3) by inserting “located outside the United States” after “nonproductive well” in the last sentence thereof.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by this section shall apply to costs paid or incurred after the date of the enactment of this Act.

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. President, I thank my friend from Oregon for his overly kind remarks. I have enjoyed working with him on this particular project. It is very clear he has the initiative on this legislation, but I am happy to respond to his initiative and lend what assistance I possibly can.

I want to make just a few additional comments about the presentation he has made. I have always been very nervous about CAFE standards. For those who are watching and don't know

what CAFE standards mean, it has nothing to do with lunch, but it comes from the acronym CAFE, or corporate aggregate fleet emissions, having to do with automobiles.

I have always thought that whenever government gets in the way of the market, government tends to make mistakes with the market. I think we can look back over the years of the CAFE standards, and in an effort to get lower emissions and more efficiency out of our automobiles, we have had a situation where manufacturers have had to make cars people don't want to buy, just to make the CAFE standard requirements. I am always nervous about that. That is one of the reasons I have been hesitant to support CAFE standards.

Here is a solution that will create incentives for people to buy lower emission automobiles, or more efficient automobiles, without dictating what those automobiles will be and without dictating a Federal target. It simply says: If you buy a car that gets higher mileage than the CAFE standard average, to a certain extent, as the Senator from Oregon has explained, the Federal Government will give you a rebate. Now, it is a tax rebate. It is a tax credit. So that is cash in your pocket if you pay income taxes, and 50 percent of American wage earners do not pay income taxes. This is one of the things we have to understand. The income tax is so constructed that it applies only to the top 50 percent of Americans, and the majority is paid by the top 5 percent of Americans.

So you can say: Well, the tax credit isn't really fair because only the people at the top get to take advantage of it. So in the bill that the Senator from Oregon has crafted and what I am cosponsoring, a car buyer can say: Instead of the tax credit, once the whole deal has been made, the price negotiated, I want my \$630 or my \$1,000 or my \$1,800 or whatever it might be on the deal to go against my responsibility for a downpayment.

Now, we very carefully have not put it in a situation where it can be part of a deal because we think the car dealer will say: Ok. I will simply raise the price by the amount of the rebate and do a little bait and switch and not give strong economic incentives for somebody who really understands what is going on to buy this particular car. The dealer doesn't know when the buyer comes in whether the buyer is going to take the amount as a tax rebate directly to the buyer or whether he is going to apply it to the downpayment. So the dealer cannot do any bait and switch or smoke and mirrors to try to take advantage of that. That is one of the talking points in favor of this particular approach.

But it means, as the Senator from Oregon has said, that the government now becomes technology neutral. The government says: We don't really care whether the increased mileage comes as a result of a hybrid or, as one auto

manufacturer said, improved diesel, or some other technology that no one has thought of. This means that someone who is working on additional technology that needs a little bit of a nudge to have people buy it doesn't have to put that aside and say: Well, I can't compete with the subsidy that is created for hybrid. I have something that will get just as good mileage as a hybrid, but I can't put it on the marketplace because the present law says you get so much of an advantage for hybrid but not for this new one that I have come up with. So the government stays technology neutral and tax neutral in terms of the impact on the people who get the advantage of it, and the manufacturer deals directly with the customer in producing the kinds of automobiles people want to buy. And if people say: I really don't want to buy that automobile, if CAFE standards disappear, the manufacturer can say: OK, if you don't want to buy it, we won't produce it. Whereas, now there is pressure; we have to produce it in order to meet the CAFE average, whether people want to buy it or not.

Economics is all about incentives. This is the right kind of government intervention to create incentives that I think ultimately will correct some of the wrong kinds of government intervention, however well intentioned, that we have seen.

So I am delighted with the leadership shown by my friend from Oregon. I am happy to work with him on this issue, as I am working with him on other issues. I think it is an example of the kind of bipartisan approach to solve the Nation's problems that we all need to follow. I congratulate him, salute him for his leadership, and I am happy to be part of the team.

By Mrs. CLINTON:

S. 3909. A bill to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to provide assistance for developing countries to promote quality basic education and to establish the achievement of universal basic education in all developing countries as an objective of United States foreign assistance policy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mrs. CLINTON. Mr. President, for several years now, I have been working to raise the profile of the issue of the more than 100 million children around the world who are out of school.

An April 2004 report authored by Barbara Herz and Gene Sperling, in conjunction with the Center on Universal Education at the Council on Foreign Relations, clearly demonstrated in striking fashion the overwhelming and incontrovertible evidence on the need to invest in girls' education. It catalogs literally hundreds of rigorous studies on the tangible economic, social, and political gains that come from giving a girl the opportunity to learn. Let me highlight a few of the report's findings: A single year of primary education correlates with a 10-20

percent increase in women's wages later in life. Academic studies find the return to a year of secondary education is even higher—in the 15 to 25 percent range.

An extra year of a woman's education has been shown to reduce the risk that her children will die in infancy by 5 to 10 percent.

Education offers what the World Bank has referred to as a window of hope in helping prevent the spread of AIDS among today's children. A recent study of a school-based AIDS education program in Uganda found a 75 percent reduction in the likelihood that children would be sexually active in their last year of primary school.

Girls' education is the best single policy for reducing fertility and therefore achieving sustainable families, according to a recent survey of the academic literature. In Brazil, for example, illiterate mothers have an average of 6 children while literate mothers choose to have less than 3 children, and are better able to care for an invest in their children's well-being.

A study of South Asia and Sub-Saharan Africa found that from 1960 to 1992, more equal education between men and women could have led to nearly 1 percent higher annual per capita GDP growth.

The report also documents in extensive detail what I have seen in many countries—that the most effective way to reach the goal of getting all girls in school is by encouraging countries to make a firm commitment to universal basic education for all children. When countries devise and adopt specific targeted strategies to address the unique obstacles girls face, they improve the reach and quality of education for all children, both girls and boys.

Two years ago, Representative NITA LOWEY and I introduced the Education for All Act, legislation that I am proud to reintroduce today. This bill would enable us to increase our spending on global education initiatives in order to help millions of children around the world have the opportunity to receive an education.

At the time we originally introduced this bill, we may have seemed like we were dreamers to expect a G8 nation like ours to take such a bold step on education in Africa and the rest of the developing world.

Yet earlier this year we saw the UK put forward \$15 billion over the next 10 years. This means that the UK, a nation with an economy about one-sixth our size, will be spending three times more than the U.S. to ensure that every boy—and particularly every girl—has a chance for a free education.

I know that our current commitment does not represent the generous heart or the wise minds of the American people. And they know that education—particularly the education of girls—is the best investment we can make to reducing global poverty; they know that education is our best social vaccine against the spread of HIV/AIDS.

There is no greater proof of such big hearts and wise minds as the young people from all over the United States, as well as around the world whom I have met, and who have shared with me their commitment to advocate for children thousands of miles away who they still consider to be their friends—their brothers and sisters who deserve the opportunity to learn.

I am proud to stand with these children in support of their friends around the world. They understand that in order to make our world more peaceful and secure in the long term, girls and boys must be given the chance to read, to write, and to get a basic education.

Education has to be the foundation of any strategy to secure peace and prosperity around the world, because when children can reach their potential, we are all better for it, and this bill will help provide a strong foundation for our efforts to help children around the world.

NOTICE OF HEARING

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

Mr. MCCAIN. Mr. President, I would like to announce that the Committee on Indian Affairs will meet on Wednesday, September 20, 2006, at 9:30 a.m. in room 485 of the Russell Senate Office Building to conduct an oversight hearing on the Tribal Self Governance: Obstacles and Impediments to Expansion of Self Governance.

Those wishing additional information may contact the Indian Affairs Committee at 202-224-2251.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS AND FORESTS

Mr. CRAIG. Mr. President, I would like to announce for the information of the Senate and the public that S. 3000, a bill to grant rights-of-way for electric transmission lines over certain Native allotments in the State of Alaska, has been added to the agenda of the hearing scheduled before the Subcommittee on Public Lands and Forests scheduled for Wednesday, September 27, at 10 a.m. in room SD-628.

Because of the limited time available for the hearing, witnesses may testify by invitation only. However, those wishing to submit written testimony for the hearing record should send two copies of their testimony to the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources, U.S. Senate, Washington, DC 20510-6150.

For further information, please contact Frank Gladics at 202-224-2878, Dick Bouts at 202-224-7545, or Sara Zecher 202-224-8276.

SECURE FENCE ACT OF 2006— MOTION TO PROCEED

CLOTURE MOTION

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, we will be closing down shortly, but I have a few items of business, and I have had a chance to talk to the Democratic leadership about this next item.

Mr. President, I now proceed to Calendar No. 615, H.R. 6061. I send a cloture motion to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The cloture motion having been presented under rule XXII, the Chair directs the clerk to read the motion.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the motion to proceed to Calendar No. 615, H.R. 6061, a bill to establish operational control over the international land and maritime borders of the United States.

Bill Frist, Ted Stevens, Robert Bennett, Lisa Murkowski, Mike Enzi, Pat Roberts, Jeff Sessions, Orrin Hatch, Wayne Allard, Thad Cochran, James Inhofe, Trent Lott, John Ensign, Jon Kyl, Tom Coburn, Mitch McConnell, John Cornyn.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, I ask that the mandatory quorum be waived.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. FRIST. Mr. President, last week we passed the Port Security Improvement Act. Indeed, that means we are one step closer to plugging the hole in our port security. We are one step closer to securing America's more than 300 maritime ports of entry. That is progress.

This port security bill that we passed was about vigilance. We are in the midst of a war with radical ideologues, militant extremists who will stop at nothing to destroy our Nation. They search for our weak spots and they seek ways to exploit them. On 9/11 we learned just how creative our enemy can be. Just last month we saw it again with the plot in Great Britain among terrorists to carry out what has become known as Gatorade bombing; that is, the destruction of aircraft and human life by using liquids.

We share a 1,951-mile border with Mexico. It doesn't take much creativity to imagine how terrorists might seek to exploit that border. It is time to secure that border with Mexico. That is why just a few moments ago I filed cloture on the motion to proceed to the Secure Fence Act of 2006.

The overwhelming majority of people who violate our borders do so in search of jobs—but not all of them. Some cross to deal drugs and commit crimes. Intelligence reports show that even al-Qaida considers our borders a key vulnerability. Without effective border control, we can't tell those looking for honest work from those bent on mayhem. Under the Secure Fence Act, Customs and Border Protection will take responsibility for securing every inch of our border with Mexico. Engineers and construction workers will erect two-layer reinforced fencing along the entire border. Hundreds of new cameras and sensors will be installed. Unmanned aircraft will supplement existing air and ground patrols.

The resulting finished network will give us complete operational control over our entire border, and it will go a